

Application No. 10/619,274

Art Unit 3673

AMENDMENT

Page 5

### REMARKS

By the preceding amendments, the applicant has responded to the rejection of claims 3 through 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, by rearranging claim 3 without intending to change its scope, whereby to clarify that the preamble of claim 3 and the preamble of claim 4 are commensurate with each other, and by amending claim 5 to claim, positively, a "casting" step.

Claims 1 though 8, as filed originally, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barth *et al.* (US 4,185,939) in view of Jansson *et al.* (US 5,108,222). You are requested to reconsider this rejection.

Jansson *et al.* discloses an articulated mat and teaches that the articulated mat comprises a geogrid and discrete, separately cast, concrete blocks. See column 1, lines 57-58; see column 3, line 11; see column 4, line 40. Jansson *et al.* does not disclose or suggest providing a concrete slab that is breakable along relatively thinner portions to form discrete, relatively thicker blocks.

Barth *et al.* discloses a concrete slab that is breakable along so-called "weakening" zones to form individual stones. Barth *et al.* does not disclose or suggest embedding a geogrid in the concrete slab. Barth *et al.* does not evidence a need, reason, or motivation to hold together such stones after the concrete slab has been broken along the "weakening" zones.

The applicant submits that nothing in Baert *et al.* or in Jansson *et al.* would motivate a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the concrete slab of Barth *et al.*, as posited by the patent examiner, to include an embedded geogrid. The applicant submits, therefore, that the claims, as amended by the preceding amendments, are patentable and should be now allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

By Allen J. Hoover  
Allen J. Hoover  
Reg. No. 24,103

March 9, 2004